

In August 2005 the following proposal was sent to several lists for comment. There weren't many replies at the time, but there have been more questions about this idea from catalogers who work with online integrating resources. As the message below indicates, CONSER discussed this last year, but we realized we needed to discuss this more widely with BIBCO members.

Proposal for a Provider-Neutral Record for Online Integrating Resources

As a follow-up to a discussion at the CONSER Operations meeting in May, I invite a wider discussion on a provider neutral approach to cataloging integrating resources. The CONSER meeting discussion summary is available from: <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/conop2005.html#13>

This would be similar to the aggregator neutral cataloging policy for E-Serials. Peter Fletcher presented this topic at the Operations meeting and drafted the proposal below. Please read through the proposal below and respond to the list or contact Peter directly with your comments. Please excuse the cross-postings.

Specific proposal: establish a provider-neutral record policy, similar to the CONSER aggregator-neutral policy, for online integrating resources, with the description based, if possible, on an original source of content such as the original publisher, or academic society or association. As with the CONSER policy, the record would contain information applicable to all provider versions, but information on the provider would only appear in citing which version the description was based on.

Discussion: some online integrating resources, normally indexes/databases, have a single source, but they often have several service providers.

Some examples:

Medline (source: National Library of Medicine; also available via OCLC, EBSCO, OVID, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, etc.)

PAIS international (source Cambridge scientific abstracts; also available also via OCLC, OVID/Silverplatter, etc.?)

Art index/fulltext/abstracts (source Wilson; also available via OCLC FirstSearch, others?)

Sociological abstracts (source CSA; also available via OVID/Silverplatter, OCLC FirstSearch, etc.?)

CINAHL (source: CINAHL Information Systems; also available via OCLC FirstSearch, OVID/Silverplatter)

Education index/full-text/abstracts (source Wilson; also available via OCLC FirstSearch)

ERIC is also a government source, but is available via many interfaces/providers such as EBSCO, OCLC FirstSearch, etc.

Presently, in the utilities, there are many records representing these kinds of titles, generally with each based on a different provider, even though the essential content is the same. Are we and library patrons well served by providing these separate records? If we had one record representing these titles, it would save cataloging time when our libraries change provider packages or acquire new ones and thus better serve the patron with faster maintenance and acquisition of these records. Also, if a library has more than one version of such a title, having one OPAC record with multiple URLs might serve patrons better than multiple records that contain subtle descriptive differences.

Some specific differences between provider versions could be noted as such: "Some providers have ". Also, ISSN policy works in favor of a provider-neutral approach, since only one ISSN will be assigned to only one record that represents a particular electronic integrating resource title. And, as with CONSER, for record consolidation, the 936 could be used to indicate which records will be deleted.